

2-16-1971

## The Opinion - Vol. 10, No. 05

Fuller Theological Seminary

Marvin Erisman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion>

---

### Recommended Citation

Fuller Theological Seminary and Erisman, Marvin, "The Opinion - Vol. 10, No. 05" (1971). *The Opinion*. 131.  
<https://digitalcommons.fuller.edu/fts-opinion/131>

This Periodical is brought to you for free and open access by the Fuller Seminary Publications at Digital Commons @ Fuller. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Opinion by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Fuller. For more information, please contact [archives@fuller.edu](mailto:archives@fuller.edu).



Vol. X No. 5

February 16, 1971

CONTENTS

"THE SONG OF MARY AMERICA" . . . . .	Paul W. Burroughs
HOW I WORK . . . . .	Donald McGavran
GOD LOVES YOU AND HAS A WONDERFUL PLAN FOR YOUR THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION . . . . .	Wayne Grudem with responses from Drs. Smedes and Fuller
A WORD TO THE FACULTY ON THE ATROPHY OF STUDENT ZEAL . . . . .	John Piper
THE FEEL OF FLOWERS . . . . .	Stephen Wilburn
SEMINARY BY CASSETTE T.V.? . . . . .	Charles Mylander
CMPTI . . . . .	Bob Pavelsky
QUOTABLE QUOTES . . . . .	Eric Behrins
A LIVING NECESSITY VERSUS A DEAD WEIGHT . . . . .	Chuck Van Engen
IS MANKIND KIND? . . . . .	Gerald H. Wilson
ANDROMEDA STRAIN ATTACKS: A FILM REVIEW . . . . .	Stan Adamson

Editor-in-Chief  
Managing Editor

Marvin Erisman  
Ted Dorman

Editorial Staff

Shel Burkhalter  
Howard Loewen

Dennis Nelson  
John Piper

Bill Spradlin

*The Opinion is published thrice quarterly by the students of Fuller Theological Seminary. Positions expressed herein are those solely of the authors and are not to be construed as the view of the Seminary, faculty, student council or editors of The Opinion.*



"THE SONG OF MARY AMERICA"  
or  
"NUREMBERG AND WAR ETHICS REVISITED"  
by Paul W. Burroughs

My Grandmother is a woman of peace.

She told her children that it was unethical to kill harmless women and children in time of war, and that it would be only fair to let the enemy get in the first shot.

My father became a lawyer and hung the nasty Natzies at Nuremberg for being unethical in time of war.

My uncles became policemen. The mayor told them that they had to let the bad guys shoot first. "That seems right," they cooed.

The following week, grandmother weeped over their graves. She loved them to death.

My mother also is a woman of peace.

She taught my brothers that it was unethical to kill harmless women and children in time of war, and that it would be only fair to let the enemy get in the first shot.

Now my brothers are buried in Nam, destroyed by harmless women and children, My mother loved them to death.

Now we are alone, grandmother, mother, the children, and I.

Alone? What about.....THE ENEMY!

Who will defend us?

POW! The enemy drops.

Who's firing that rifle? .....Grandmother?

BOOM! The enemy disintegrates.

Who threw that grenade? .....Mother?

Praise the Lord, and pass the ammunition, kids.

HOW I WORK  
by Donald McGavran

I am a man under orders from the Head. It is, therefore, my constant effort to please Him. My system of priorities, allocation of time, and style of writing must pass an inspection not mine. How will I succeed in this effort is, of course, another matter, of which fortunately I am not judge.

In my system of priorities, people come first. Not people in general, but those to whom I am sent, for whom I can do something. I have little time



## HOW I WORK (con't)

for casual conversation; but hours for those who have a claim to my services. In my concept of stewardship, nothing can take the place of understanding individuals and doing something for them.

Duties come second. One receives a salary for a certain kind of work done. I get paid for teaching classes and deaning the School of Missions. Many other duties hover on the fringe, however--writing letters to nationals and missionaries carrying heavy responsibilities in many parts of the world, speaking in churches on missions, attending and speaking at conferences, writing on missions for magazines, writing books calling attention to the extraordinary opportunities to disciple men and societies today. It is a constant battle to know how to divide my time between all these different duties--in such a way as will please God.

Keeping the body and mind in shape comes third. Pleasure (including eating) come well down the scale. A handful of raisins, a dozen crackers, and a flask of tea constitute my regular lunch--not because I hate tasty food, but simply because it takes so much more time to get. I eat heartily when I go to lunch or dinner as a social duty!!

This system gives me little time to do serious writing. People and tending the store (my first and second priorities) eat up the hours and days. So I use vacations to write. My best known book The Bridges of God was written in the depths of an Indian forest where I spent my four week vacation in 1953. I stalked, rifle in hand, between five and six in the morning, sat at my typewriter from six to six, stalked again from six to seven, and wrote till nine. My last book Understanding Church Growth was written in the summer of 1968 when recuperating from an operation. Mrs. McGavran and I hid away in Dr. Schoonhoven's house and there I glued the seat of the pants to the seat of the chair for twelve hours a day. And walked two miles each evening to keep in shape.

The preparation for books, however, is done from day to day. Ideas come constantly and are written down. Books and magazines, which I devour as time permits, yield many ideas--some to quote with approval and some to slaughter. Ideas which come in the middle of the night are often duds, but I get up and write them down just the same. Some gleam.

I strive for clarity and truth in my writing. Obscurantist authors are my bete noir. I reject the assumption that the more difficult a sentence is to understand, the more profound is the writer. I, therefore, shun learned jargon and--as far as possible--technical and little used words.

I rewrite many times. My first draft is always revised ruthlessly. I like to use a professional editor for the final draft. When others are going to spend days reading--and thousands do--I owe it to them to iron out the wrinkles, remove the ambiguities, and make my position crystal clear. What I say must also be true--as true as it is possible to make it. Making it clear and true sometimes leads me into strife with rules of various sorts. My ancestors came from Ireland and I have scant regard for rules for rules sake. I do not hesitate to over-emphasize a point if the situation in 1971 requires it! If in 1981 the situation requires overstatement on the other side, I shall cheerfully comply.

This is the first time I have described my way of working. Or even meditated on it. Consequently the above must be taken as something struck off in the heat of battle. I am sure it leaves much unsaid. Yet it intends to be true and I know it is clear--and with that I shall have to leave it. To put more time on it would probably not please the Head!



# GOD LOVES YOU AND HAS A WONDERFUL PLAN FOR YOUR THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

by Wayne Grudem

I want to ask a very simple question: Is the Bible really the basis for anything we study at Fuller Seminary?

Let me explain what I mean. I don't want to say that every class period should be a topical Bible study. But I would like a Biblical approach to each course. It seems to me that the fundamental question underlying a course should be, "What does the Bible say about this subject?" Only after that question has been answered can we ask, "What have various men said about this subject?" I have been disappointed to find that this is not the approach used at Fuller.

Look for instance at the first three core courses for Juniors. In Prolegomena, the basic question should have been, "What does the Bible say about theology?" We could have discovered what Biblical guidelines there are for how we do theology and why we do theology. After that, we could have read various theologians and evaluated them according to a Biblical standard. But the whole question was omitted; not once did we need a Bible in the course.

From this standpoint, Hermeneutics was much the same: we were restricted to the opinions of men. The basic question in this course was, "What do Smart (neo-orthodox), Adler (Jewish) and Dr. Fuller (whose position was 'read it like any other book') say about how to interpret the Bible?" Although we dealt with God's Word on other questions, we never used it to answer the most important question, "What does the Bible say about how to interpret the Bible?"

Evangelism was more Biblically oriented, but it still suffered from imbalance. The question, "What does the Bible say about evangelism?" was certainly asked, but in our readings and discussions it was always far subordinate to the question, "What seems to be working in churches today?" The second is a valid question, but the first must have priority.

Have we forgotten that God has established the basis for theological education? "All scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, in order that (hina) the man of God may be exactly fitted to his job (artios), completely furnished (eksertismenos) for every good work." (II Tim. 3:16-17).

Give me less of men's opinions, more of God's Word.

## A RESPONSE

by Lewis Smedes

I think a simple answer to Mr. Grudem's simple question is: Yes, the Bible really is the basis for what we study at Fuller.

A basis, as Mr. Grudem knows, does not work the same as a text-book. It is the ground on which everything else rests, the source from which everything else grows. One does not always have to set his basis up front, announce it, and put it on display.

Mr. Grudem's complaints are, I suspect, more about method than about substance. At least I am sure it must be so in the case of Prolegomena. I tried to make it clear that the Bible does not in fact teach us about theology; that it reveals the living God, in its own way, with its own language, but does not teach theology or tell us about theology. I tried to let Calvin demonstrate for us the difference between theological discourse about God and biblical discourse, and the reasons for the difference. I tried, meanwhile, to show how the Bible functions as the norm for theology even while it does not serve as a model for theology. And the like. Still, Mr. Grudem says, "the whole question was omitted." The very fact that he thinks it was omitted



## IN RESPONSE (con't)

is evidence that I must have done a rather bad job.

But I suspect, from the way Mr. Grudem sets up his question, that I would not have made him happy no matter how good my method was. What I hear him ask for is a biblicistic approach to all the subjects in the curriculum. A biblicistic approach, in my book, assumes that the Bible has a clear and tailor made answer to every question raised by every course. All the biblicist has to do is cull the answer from appropriate texts in the Bible, and then whack away with it at all human efforts to come to grips with the question. I do not think the Bible is that kind of book. And that is why I do not think it can be used the way I hear Mr. Grudem telling us it ought to be used.

MY REPLY TO W. GRUDEM  
by Dr. Fuller

It is a logical impossibility to conceive of letting the Bible be the absolute beginning for our understanding of how to interpret the Bible. Suppose there were certain passages that told us how to interpret all the rest of the Bible. On what basis would we know how to construe these passages, if we had to start just with them without any prior consideration of how to get through to their intended meaning? There is no meaning but a construed meaning, and therefore if there were passages telling us how to interpret the rest of the Bible, we would have to construe these passages. But in order to do this we would have to start with the whole involved question of how to get through to what an author intended to say by means of the semantic symbols he used.

If Mr. Grudem agrees there is no meaning but a construed meaning, then I think he will have to concede that a course in how to interpret the Bible must begin by considering how semantic symbols should be properly construed. His concern, however, is the same as mine: to let the Bible speak for itself without being forced to fit the presuppositions arising from any special human or churchly interest, and he will remember how I climax this course by saying that only that hermeneutic is satisfactory which lets the Bible speak for itself and which blockades the Church from twisting any of the Bible's teaching to fit more with what it would like the Bible to say.

A WORD TO THE FACULTY ON THE ATROPHY OF STUDENT ZEAL  
by John Piper

Dr. Munger said in chapel last quarter that the faculty is concerned about the atrophy of spiritual zeal which students seem to experience while here at Fuller. The concern is understandable. An institution that produces ministers without heart is simply failing. Of course the blame for this failure does not belong to any one group--students, faculty, administration--but to each in varying degrees. What shall we do?

In this little article I want to make several suggestions to the faculty which, if heeded, might contribute in some small way to the spiritual growth of their students. Perhaps in the next issue one of our teachers will have some suggestions for us.



# A WORD TO THE FACULTY ON THE ATROPHY OF STUDENT ZEAL (con't)

- 1) Every teacher should carefully consider the effect which his attitude towards fundamentalism has on his students. What happens in our hearts when teacher and student pool all their powers of sarcasm and ridicule to annihilate a "poor ignorant brother"? Of course, that is an overstatement; the damage is usually done with a smirk or an embarrassed apology for one's long-abandoned heritage. How much better it would be if concern rather than scorn were the norm. Nor does it matter if they are bitter towards us; few of us have forgiven our critics 490 times.
- 2) On the other side of the spectrum it would be helpful, I think, if our teachers examined their attitudes toward heresy. My analysis may be wrong, but here it is. If everything in the world hangs on Jesus Christ and we love him with our whole heart, then it seems to me that when we encounter a theology which in effect says, "Your Jesus is a phony," we will respond either with anger or concern or both. But how can we possibly be neutral! Neutrality means that neither side is worth getting worked up about; and that is precisely the definition of spiritual deadness. I have very few memories of my teachers sincerely lamenting the ultimate consequences of the bad theology we discuss.
- 3) An example to emulate: Right in the middle of an academic discussion about faith and reason Jim Morgan said to me, "John, I love Jesus so much I think I could die for him." I've never been quite the same since.
- 4) Teachers should never show bitterness to students who have a shoddy theology. I have seen teachers laugh behind students' backs at a naive idea. And that is the very opposite of edification. Love is patient and rejoices in truth.
- 5) Finally, come down and eat with us. If you don't like the food, brown-bag it with the rest of us. We need you.

## THE FEEL OF FLOWERS by Stephen S. Wilburn

The feel of flowers once lost in a wood  
Escapes and gathers in a neighborhood  
And people and things but gently slow down  
While life-sighing Spring melts all around.

The banker's wife in a corner home  
Has breakfast in her den, alone,  
And John, the clerk, stays home till noon.  
For love is his and none too soon.



## THE FEEL OF FLOWERS (con't)

The infant sun in early day  
 Commissions its spirit to those who pray  
 That cold and death have somehow left -  
 Are crossed and gone where a hill's cleft

Bore winter through a week-end's night  
 But not until the first day's light  
 Had firmly warmed their hearty cold -  
 Then they breathed and then were bold.

For Spring has come with the Rising Son  
 And yet until all things are done  
 'Just indian summer' say someone's feet,  
 And stays inside and turns up the heat.

But some have stood and then looked out -  
 Have seen that newly grown things shout  
 That fragrance flows from Nature's side  
 A mingled sacrament death can't hide.

## SEMINARY BY CASSETTE TV?

by Charles Mylander

Life magazine (October 16, 1970) predicts cassette TV will be marketed throughout the United States within two years. People will rent or buy programs for entertainment, and education. Will their education remain limited to secular subjects, or will seminaries move into the sizable market? Will theological education remain the privilege of the exclusive few or will it become a live option to thousands?

Coupled with the extension seminary concept now proving so fruitful in mission lands, cassette TV could multiply Fuller's ministry a hundredfold. Let me illustrate how the plan would work. Let us assume John Washington Jones is an evangelical black pastor in Watts. In his church he knows four laymen and two college seniors who would join him for theological study once a week. One of the laymen in his church has a new Cassette TV attachment, and will volunteer his home. From the Fuller catalog they select one of the Junior fall term core courses such as Prolegomena. In addition to tuition fees and books, they also purchase programmed study guides and rent the TV cassettes of lectures and classroom discussions. (In low-income areas such as Watts, scholarships and subsidies would not be out of the question). Each week the pastor supervises the discussion, administers a brief quiz from the seminary, and receives reports from the field work he has assigned. (The field work assignments assist the pastor in his ministry and justify his time in leading the study group.) Results of the quizzes along with a paper or two for the term are sent to the seminary extension department. In cases where a theological library is too distant for research, added collateral would substitute. At the close of the course, each student takes his final at the seminary or approved testing center from an authorized person. Each group could work through a course at their own pace. Quality need not be sacrificed because slower learners could take as much time as needed. The group goes at one pace, however, to preserve the values of discussion and interaction.



## SEMINARY BY CASSETTE TV? (con't)

Can you imagine how many blacks, chicanos and laymen in suburbia would rush to obtain a top flight theological education in their own parishes? Can you imagine how many pastors would improve their preaching and total ministry as a result of such groups? Can you imagine the benefits in quality of teaching improvement in the local church, as well as outreach in mission churches as the students advance in their education.

Is such a seminary-via-cassette TV feasible for Fuller Seminary? Let's look at our credentials and resources. First, Fuller Seminary is not owned or operated by any one denomination. It thus has an entree into a vast number of churches. Second, Fuller has the recognized academic quality to prevent such a plan from becoming a gimmick or cheap shortcut. Extension seminary is not a diploma mill. Third, Fuller has the specialists to put such a plan into operation. Mel White has the communication know-how for developing TV cassettes. Dr. Winter is a pioneer and recognized authority in extension seminary education in mission lands. Numerous professors now use syllabi or their own published texts. Almost without exception they are well-qualified to write programmed study guides for the textbooks they use. Dr. Hubbard speaks to a vast radio audience every week, many of whom would besiege their pastor to start such a study group at his suggestion. By using a tuition and credit plan, the courses could be self-supporting.

Like Ford Motor Company with their Mustang, the first seminary to develop such a top-quality program will sweep the country. Will Fuller Seminary develop a bold strategy for taking theology to the masses?

### CMPTI

by Bob Pavelsky

Since the beginning of this school year, I have been one of the representatives of the School of Psychology on the Student Council. One of the responsibilities I have had is to be the Chairman of the Committee on Missions-Psychology-Theology (order is alphabetical) Integration (CMPTI). The purpose of this committee is to make proposals which can lead to integration of the three schools at Fuller. Integration has long been a key term at Fuller, but unfortunately, it has been restricted to Psychology and Theology. I think that it is time to consider the School of Missions in our concept of integration.

Now, the term integration can be, and often is, nebulous, and we really cannot consider another school in a concept that we do not understand. I would propose that at the student level we consider integration to mean, "discovering the unique contribution of each school that can be incorporated into our own professional activities." Discovery occurs when we attend classes, or read books (as per Alder), or when we find out what the unique contribution of each school has been for the students and professors of that school.

One of the things that has kept us from making these discoveries at the personal level is that we are suffering from an identity crisis. That is to say that, we really do not know who each other is. The way I understand the situation, it is possible for a student to enter the School of Missions, and for as long as he is here to have only minimal, if any, contact with a Theology student or a Psychology student. Likewise, many of the Psychology



## CMPTI (con't)

students (approximately  $\frac{1}{2}$  of this year's entering class) came to Fuller with B.D. degrees. These students could be here 4-5 years and never see a Theology student (except for a few in the integration seminars) or a Missions student. Those Psychology students who enter the program without a B.D. have the greatest amount of interaction, but because of different interests, cliques form with the Psychologists in one and the Theologians in the other. (I might add here that I am not intending to make value judgements. These statements are meant to be definitive as I see the situation.) This identity crisis keeps us apart personally which keeps us from getting an experiential feeling for what the different schools can contribute to each other. Before integration can really occur, at any level, there must be personal integration. Until this gulf is bridged there cannot be successful integration at any level: Interpersonal, personal, theoretical, or academic. In a time when there is talk of separate worship, separate areas of study, and separate recreational activities we cannot afford an identity crisis and still hope to integrate. We can, however, have our separate activities and still affirm each others identity.

There are three methods that the CMPTI is going to be using which we hope will enable us to affirm each others identity. All three will be using the written media until we can explore new ways to communicate this information. The first method is already under way. Three professors and three students from each of the three schools have been asked to respond to the following questions: 1) Who am I and where am I from? 2) Why am I here at Fuller? 3) What do I hope for in the future as a result of my being here? These responses will be published in the Opinion. We are going to try and do this for each issue of the Opinion in the hope that the information will provide some common ground personally or academically to establish a new relationship or to build upon an already existing relationship. Secondly, we plan to have the professors involved in the integration seminars provide us with a brief description and evaluation of what was accomplished in the seminar. This will provide information about integration where it is experiencing some of its greatest tensions. Lastly, we plan to run a series of articles in the Opinion in which both professors and students respond to the question, "What is the unique contribution of your school to the other two schools at Fuller Seminary?"

These are some of the ideas of the CMPTI which we hope will provide some means of integration at all levels. This is a new endeavor for us. I hope that we have correctly assessed and proposed answers to some of the questions and problems of integration. If you have any suggestions, we would be grateful for your help.

QUOTABLE QUOTES  
by Eric Behrens

The first quote comes from an article entitled "Black Theological Education: Successes and Failures" which appeared in the January 27, 1971, issue of The Christian Century. In this article the magazine conducted a survey of 25 seminaries, "to discover how seriously those schools were taking the need for black religious studies on their campuses. The institutions surveyed included seminaries small and large, independent and denominational, university-located and separately located. The numbers of black students enrolled ranged from two (Fuller Seminary in Pasadena, Calif.) to 138 (Interdenominational Theological Center in Atlanta, Ga.)." (p. 129)



# QUOTABLE QUOTES (con't)

The second quote is taken from the section of the 1970-72 Fuller Theological Seminary catalogue entitled, "The Character of Fuller Seminary.": "The Seminary believes that the hour has come when the church must apply the gospel to the real world which surrounds us. Above all, this means that Christians should see to it that all men--red, yellow, black, and white--enjoy equal fellowship in the Church as well as equal justice in society." (p. 17)

A substantial solution to eliminate the clear discrepancy between these two quotes would be for Fuller to begin a determined effort to recruit black students and to effect certain changes in the curriculum for their benefit. The difficulty of effecting these curricular changes, but also its importance, is well summed up in this final quote (although it applies to the university situation, it is easy to see its relevance for theological studies): "Black America's young, with its leadership reservoir depleted and its culture and heritage devastated, have educational needs one dimension beyond those of the average American student. College must create a black leadership group that readily and permanently identifies with, and is culturally proud of, other black Americans in order to counteract the negative influences produced by centuries of Uncle Tom survival tactics that still plague the race. Hence the need for Afro-American studies, black student groups, and the black experience in general--at both black and white universities." (Elliott Moorman, "The Benefits of Anger", The Saturday Review, June 21, 1969, p. 72)

Fuller Seminary is beginning to act in this vital area, the most significant activities being the appointment of a black trustee and the work of the Committee on Ethnic Involvement. With its strong Biblical emphasis, it is in a unique position to play a significant role in changing the course of worsening race relations in the United States. Studies have shown again and again that the church is still the major power source in the Black community (a fact which black militant groups are increasingly taking into consideration). The challenge is clear and the time for rapid and significant action is almost overdue. Hopefully, the Fuller Seminary community is aware of this fact, and will not become discouraged by the great costs and amount of work this challenge poses. The rewards will surely be at least as great, not only for the seminary but for the Church of Christ as well.

## A LIVING NECESSITY VS A DEAD WEIGHT

by Chuck Van Engen

Anxiously, fearfully, breathlessly we awaited our test results. We were about to find out what others thought we were worth. We were about to find out how much better or worse each of us was than the "other guy". The results were handed out. I looked at my test scores and tried to hide the joy I felt. I'd spent long hours preparing for this Greek exam. I had been rewarded. I felt good. But my laughter soon was turned to inner tears and profuse embarrassment when a fellow across the room asked, "And what did YOU get, Chuck?" The words were innocent enough. But the meaning hurt deeply. The meaning was something like this. "Did you dare do well again, Chuck? Did you have to go and trod us down by breaking the curve? Why don't you fail once? Better yet, why don't you take the final right now and get out of here? Did you dare do well again, Chuck, you dirty rat?"



# A LIVING NECESSITY VS A DEAD WEIGHT (con't)

How sad! Just a few weeks before we had compared notes and found I spent about twice as much time on Greek as this fellow. We had found I have been blessed with a better background in languages. I tried to explain to him that a bi-lingual mind will catch on to another language faster than a mono-lingual one. But all this that we had previously agreed on was cast to the winds in that one defensive moment of condemnation. And when one reads Jeff Cotter's frustrated thesis (Opinion, Jan. 20, pp. 13-14), one sees the disease is far spread in our campus. Where is the ailment? Where lies the cure?

Does it lie in throwing out evaluation altogether? If this were done we students would not be able to judge where we were academically. The professors would have no means of evaluating their effectiveness as teachers. There would be no accreditation available for the school. Even if we had the self-discipline and incentive to study without grades (which few of us would have), yet we would have no way of knowing how clearly we understood the material. We would be like a ship which is never taken to dry-dock for inspection. Soon we would sink.

Evaluation is desirable. It is necessary in political, business, small-group, family, personal life-why not in academic life? Because, you say, it has three inherent evils. It promotes competition, it gives one a false sense of worth, and often is not true evaluation anyhow. It might be good to analyze these criticisms.

An analogy would prove helpful. Suppose I am trying to play on a football team. Only a certain number can play, and there are too many trying out. Therefore, some must be cut off the team. This means that I must show myself better than the guy next to me. Competition has begun. But is the fact of the cut that which necessarily entails competition? NO It is the fact that I want to look better than the other guy that entails the competition. If I were not interested in beating John out of a position on the football team (say, if I were willing to wait until basketball where he would not have a chance at my star position), I would not be competing with John. Or, if John were so much better than I was at football that I was not a threat to his position, he would be unaware of the competition, and would be glad to give me some pointers. Competition stems from a desire for self-aggrandizement-NOT FROM EVALUATION. And what does Jesus have to say about it? "He who saves his life shall lose it." This is a form of pride, a sin strongly condemned by the Bible.

So we have found our first criticism to be not against evaluation per se, but rather against our own heart of pride. How can we remedy it? That pride must be done away with. What comes of it? In the parable of the talents, the owner found two men faithful and one unfaithful. The one who was unfaithful was not the one who got a C, but the one who slothfully did nothing-did not even work his own talent. But the one with only two talents was rewarded as much as the one with five. The one with five actually got an A. The one with two only got a B- average...he had less to work with. But THEY WERE EQUALLY FAITHFUL, and equally rewarded. So must we look at grades. God does not call us to "beat the other guy out". Rather, He calls us to do as much as we can with the background we have been given. Can you trust the Lord to use the talent you have-rather than bemoan not being a linguist, or philosopher, or preacher? Can you do what God calls you to do now and leave the future in His hands? If you must guarantee the future by constantly taking your grade average in your own hands, then your God is truly too small. And this does not mean you will work less. If you grab hold of this principle of faithfulness, you will find, as I have, that you will work harder than you did before.



## A LIVING NECESSITY VS A DEAD WEIGHT (con't)

But, you say, I don't like my worth being reflected in a grade. It's NOT. Many of us say we believe in the principle in Romans 12 about each man having his own gift, and all having equal worth in the sight of God. But the way Jeff Cotter and the fellow in Greek class, and many other students talk, they sound just like the Corinthian church, to which Paul wrote and again emphasized that the fact that one person has one gift and not another has NOTHING TO DO WITH HIS WORTH. Each member of the body needs every other, and ALL are equally beloved in the sight of God. No matter, whether it is high or low, your grade reflects absolutely nothing about your worth as an individual. The only event which reflects that is the crucifixion.

How does this work out? I may have a gift in a certain area, while you in another. I am not worth any more or less than you. Rather, we need each other. I may be a lousy preacher, but I know that I will be called upon to speak in public. Therefore, I come to you and ask that you teach me to mimic that gift given to you. And I may grasp linguistics quickly, which will be essential for your ministry. Therefore you come to me and I aid you in understanding that which comes easily to me. We are "members one of another". Fellow students, COMPETENCE MUST NOT BE EQUATED WITH WORTH.

Okay. Then maybe we should not have any evaluation. Each man should simply "do his own thing". NO. We have already seen that lack of an evaluation process would leave us in chaos. However, evaluation is notoriously lousy, you say. And I agree with you. Here lies our second evil. First, we found out that the evil heart of pride lies at the root of much of the evil results of evaluation. However, a second evil in the system is the slothful festing which is often indulged in. Sometimes I get the impression the professors are more interested in taking groups to churches, or publishing their own articles, or doing outside preaching than they are in giving an accurate evaluation of their students. True, there is always a human element involved in this evaluation. A professor will always grade up that which reflects his bias-especially if it is put in his terminology. However, within that human limit there is possibility for differentiation. (Even Jeff Cotter agrees on this point.) However, at times this grading becomes down-right negligent. For instance, everyone agrees that a paper can only be written well if the author has a certain audience in mind. On an exam, the professor is that audience. It is highly unfair to the student if, when the paper is assigned, it is understood that the professor will be that audience, and in fact, a student grades that paper. This is high treason! Of course the professor can re-grade the papers, but then he might as well have done them himself. It is the responsibility of the professor to give as accurate an evaluation as possible. Otherwise, he is lying about the ability of the student.

In conclusion, it is the student's responsibility to work as hard as he can. It is the professor's responsibility to evaluate that work as accurately as possible. And it is Jeff Cotter's responsibility to examine the barrel for the one or two rotten apples before decrying the sinfulness of the whole barrel.



IS MANKIND KIND?  
by Gerald H. Wilson

Is mankind kind?  
And would you mind  
If I changed the meter  
To call him maneater?  
Neater not nicer  
A constant surprier  
Man. Kind he's not  
Nor selfless. What  
We need I am sure  
Is a manicure.

ANDROMEDA STRAIN ATTACKS...  
by Stan Adamson

Robert Wise and Michael Crichton have taken Science-Fiction Plot 5b and have made a visually exciting, tense, rewarding film. You all know the classic story on which Andromeda Strain is based. A satellite returns to Earth contaminated by a vicious microbe, which, capable of growing under any condition, kills all inhabitants of the sleepy New Mexico town where it lands. Searchers find in it two survivors (a baby and an old man) whom they return to a TOP SECRET underground Biowar laboratory in Nevada (disguised as an Agriculture Department substation) and pass through five stages of decontamination. Scientists work to isolate the vicious virus which if unchecked could wipe out the entire population of the Earth. Throw in a couple possible H-bomb detonations, a fail-safe computer system which fails, a few mad laser beams, and gruesome make-up by Bud Westmore and you have the science-fiction film for the Seventies. Right?

Well, as a matter of fact, even with all those points against it this is a good film, and especially worth seeing if you're a gadget freak. The decontamination procedures are fascinating: there's a microscanning system that's out of this world: and the computer read-outs (simulated by Doug Trumbull, effects mastermind for 2001) are gorgeous. Much of the equipment is real, and "scientific background support" came from none other than our own beloved Cal Tech and JPL. Very convincing sequences depicting the death of lab animals were supervised by the American Humane Association for the benefit of the squeamish, who may miss that as it goes by on the titles. The musical score is very impressive (for a change). There is no shapely brunette-turned-research-scientist to provide "romantic interest" (the film is too tight to need such filler), but she is replaced by a very convincing, plump, Margaret Mead type, a welcome departure from past tradition. In fact, the casting as a whole is admirable, and the acting is believable if not brilliant. The final sequence is a not boiler, but it kept us all on the edges of our seats. The film is perhaps a bit too long, cluttered by some casual references to the SDS and the CBW controversy which tend only to date the film rather than give it life. However, these are minor faults indeed, and I heartily recommend the film to those who eat up complex, technologically oriented, visually exciting films.